occur simultaneously across the entire Big Lost River watershed. This assumption is not consistent with the meteorology of the region and again calls into question the validity of the assertion that the assumptions represent conditions that have a 1% chance per year of occurring. The data that is presented in the report shows a decrease of 12% between Arco and the INEEL diversion dam.
An internal consistency problem presents itself with respect to the 2 hour hydrograph for Box Canyon. If the peak can go at least 50 miles from Howell Ranch to Arco in 6 hours (as asserted in the text); why can't it go the 7.5 miles in Box Canyon in 2 hours? The resulting attenuation of 170 CFS would seem to be legitimate and required given data presented earlier.

59-12 VIII.C (5) Pg. 15- The channel width discussion here indicates a serious inconsistency. If the Dowdy equation is used here, a channel width of 144 ft. is indicated but a bankfull width of only 38 ft. was measured. The Dowdy equation has a large uncertainty associated with it that must be quantitatively addressed. A more serious inconsistency is the selective application of the bankful discharge technique cited as "Harenberg, 1980". A similar estimate of "bankful" flow at the INEEL would lead to typical estimates of 2500 CFS for the 100 year flow. Why wasn't this important data point considered?

59-13 VIII.C (5) Pg. 16- "These assumptions would produce the largest possible flow-volume estimates for this method." The largest possible flow is by definition not a 100 year event. Also note that Bulletin 17B is not intended for the determination of flow volumes. The combined probability of a 100 year flow and a 60 day duration and a simultaneous arrival of subbasin peaks at Arco and the Howell Ranch peak arriving at Arco unattenuated and arriving at the INEEL diversion dam unattenuated is clearly much less than 1/100.

HLW & FD

EIS PROJECT - AR PF
Control # DC-60

HLW EIS Web Comments

From: HLWFDEIS Web Site
Sent: Friday, April 14, 2000 6:45 AM
To: web@jason.com
Cc: web_archive@jason.com
Subject: HLW EIS Web Comment

RECEIVED
APR 14 2000

Name: Tom Oliver
Affiliation: Studsvik, Inc.
Address1: 111 Stonemark Lane
Address2: Suite 115
City, State Zip: Columbai, SC 29210
Telephone: 803-731-8220
Date Entered: {ts '2000-04-14 06:45:19'}
Comment:
Studsvik,Inc. has recently commercialized on a large scale its patented pyrolysis/steam reforming fluid bed technology for the processing of nuclear wastes generated by the nuclear power stations at its processing facility in Erwin, TN. This technology is also directly applicable to the processing of a large quantity of the mixed wastes presently within the DOE including the SBW at INEEL. Under separate cover, Studsvik has submitted comments on the draft EIS that requests that steam reforming, an alternative to incineration, be considered in the final EIS. This technology was not full deployed when the technical evaluations for the EIS were performed, however it is now a fully proven, fully deployed technology that offers significant advantages over present processing methods and those discussed in the draft EIS.

60-1 III.D.4(4)